

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	Jacobus Henricus Diederer	Examiner:	Legesse, Henok D.
Application No.:	10/553,103	Group Art Unit:	2861
Filed:	November 14, 2005	Docket:	903-153 PCT/US
For:	PRINTING DEVICE, FLEXIBLE RESERVOIR AND WORKING CONTAINER AND FEED SYSTEM	Dated:	July 27, 2009

Confirmation No.: 2411

Certificate of EFS-Web Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via the Office's electronic filing system

Dated: July 27, 2009

Signature: John S. Sopko /John S. Sopko/

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Sir:

This statement is being submitted in accordance with M.P.E.P. §713.04 and 37 C.F.R. §1.133(b) and in response to the Telephonic Interview of July 24, 2009.

Remarks begin on page 2 of this submission.

Remarks

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Henok Legesse for discussing the above-identified application with the undersigned representative on July 24, 2009, during the telephonic interview conducted on that date. During the Interview, the Response filed July 10, 2009 was discussed. Further, the following references were also discussed Patent No. 6,267,474 to Mochizuki (hereinafter “Mochizuki”); U.S. Patent No. 6,193,354 to Ito (hereinafter “Ito”) and U.S. Patent No. 3,708,798 to Hildenbrand et al. (hereinafter “Hildenbrand”).

Applicant noted to the Examiner that independent claim 1 requires, inter alia, a “degassed printing medium”. While Mochizuki also requires, *arguendo*, a “degassed printing medium”, Ito and Hildenbrand both contact their printing medium with air spaces. As described in the publication of the subject application at paragraph [0003], such contact of printing medium with air is in direct contrast to the “degassed printing medium” limitation of claim 1. While a discussion of the oxygen levels of degassed and non-degassed ink from paragraph [0003] occurred, no agreement was reached on the patentability of including a degassed oxygen limitation in claim 1.

The “open connection” limitation of independent claim 1 was also discussed. The attorney for the Applicant argued that Mochizuki and Ito failed to disclose this limitation. The Examiner, however, for reasons not entirely understood by the undersigned attorney still maintained that an “open connection” was shown by these references. More confusing to the undersigned Attorney was the lack of consideration of dependent claims 18 and 19 by the Examiner. No agreement was reached on an offer to bring up one or both of these claims into the independent claim, even though the undersigned Attorney argued that these limitations traversed Mochizuki and Ito.

Application No.: 10/553,103
Statement of the Substance of Interview dated July 27, 2009
Reply to Telephonic Interview of July 24, 2009
Docket No.: 903-153 PCT/US
Page 3

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments concerning the above, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/John S. Sopko, Reg.# 41,321/
John S. Sopko
Registration No.: 41,321
Attorney for Applicant

HOFFMANN & BARON, LLP
6900 Jericho Turnpike
Syosset, New York 11791
(973) 331-1700